DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 928 PS 010 680

AUTHOR Prusso, Kenneth W.
TITLE Get Set Day Care: Summary Report, 1977-1978. Report No. 7943.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 61p.; For related document, see ED 164 142

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Child Development; *Day Care Programs; *Developmental Programs; Early Childhood Education; Elementary School Students; Family (Sociological Unit); *Health Services; Low Income; Parent Participation; Parents; Preschool Children; Program Effectiveness; *Psychological Services; Public Schools; *Social Services; *Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Get Set Program; Pennsylvania (Philadephia); Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes results of an evaluation of the Get Set Day Care Program in the Philadelphia public schools. The program, which provides child care services to low income families, has three purposes: (1) to enable parents or other caretakers of children to work, to receive employment-related training or education, or to receive social or health services; (2) to provide children, including the developmentally handicapped, with individualized care which contributes to their development and self sufficiency; and (3) to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests, or to preserve, rehabilitate or reunite families. In 1977-78 the program operated in 76 sites and served 4,200 children, primarily between the ages of 3 and 5. The aspects of the program examined and the measures employed were (1) child development (classroom observation, a developmental status checklist and the school achievement record of past participants), (2) social services (the number of social workers' contacts with staff and parents), (3) psychological services (members of referrals and services for developmental delay; speech, language and hearing difficulties; mental retardation; abuse and neglect; and medical or physical problems), (4) health services (screenings, treatment, health education and meals), (5) staff development (supervisors', teachers', assistants' and aides' perceptions of quantity and utility of on-site demonstrations and assistance) and (6) parent involvement (attendance at meetings and participation as volunteers). (Author/BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172928

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GET SET DAY CARE
SUMMARY REPORT
1977-1978

Report Prepared By:
Kenneth W. Prusso
of the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report Number 7943

December, 1978

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood
Evaluation Unit

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philadelphia Sch. Dist.
Off. of Res. + Eval.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 010680

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas E. Trolio

* * * * * * *

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent of Schools

* * * * * * *

Mr. Bertram H. Snead, Jr.
Director
Get Set Day Care

Miss Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

ABSTRACT

The Get Set Day Care Program, funded through the School District of Philadelphia and Title XX of the Social Services Act, provided day care for 4,200 children in 76 sites in 1977-1978. The program provided a balance of daily activities to promote motor, social, and cognitive development. Children's development status (on the average) was the same as that for the general prekindergarten population. A long term benefit to Get Set "graduates" was evidenced in reading achievement, and to some extent in mathematics achievement. Proportionally more Get Set "graduates" and all children attaining or exceeding the national norm in corresponding grades were more nearly equal, but still tended to favor the program's children.

For other areas of program services, the following highlights the major findings. Ten percent of the social service workers' contacts were made for the purpose of completing the intake process. Although the purpose of many contacts was not specified by the workers on their reports, over a third of the contacts were made with the staff of the centers, and 50% were with the parents either at the center or over the phone. Each social worker attended at least one parent meeting a month. Psychological services were available to the program participants. Two hundred thirty-six children were observed or screened during the year, 78% of who were referred to community or mental health agencies. Follow-up services were continued by the staff for 171 children. About one-fifth no longer required services by the end of the year. The Health Services component assured screening for most children, and sought remediation of problems identified. Health service workers also conducted health education. Breakfasts, lunches, and snacks meeting federal requirements were provided regularly

to all children.

Staff development was provided regularly by supervisors. The staff reported satisfaction with all services except for in-classroom training and demonstrations. A third or more of the staff reported that they had not received that particular service, even though supervisors contacted each staff member approximately six times during the year. The teaching of basic skills and social skills areas were desired topics for future staff development (two areas for which the staff seemed to note lower developmental status of the children).

Parent involvement activities tended to focus on fund raising projects and education workshops. Unlike some preschool programs, parents did not contribute most of their time to in-classroom help, probably because of working arrangements (since Get Set is a day care program rather than a short-day program).

The program was seen as satisfying its overall goals of providing services, and in producing long term benefits in reading for children as they advanced through school.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report summarizing the evaluation activities for the Get Set Day Care Program for 1977-1978 year depends primarily upon the evaluation reports of the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit Staff. Not only does the author acknowledge the work of the ECEU staff listed below, but also the technical support provided by the Division of Data Processing.

Mildred Asano - Social Services and Psychological Services Component Reports

Cleopatra Figgures - Health Services and Staff Development Component Reports

John McKinney - Parent Involvement Component Report

David Silbermann - Children's Developmental Status Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CHILD DEVELOPMENT	3
A. Classroom Observation Data	3
B. Developmental Status of Present Participants	5
C. School Achievement Data for Past Participants	6
III. SOCIAL SERVICES	6
A. Social Worker Contacts and Services	7
B. Other Functions	7
IV. PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES	7
V. HEALTH SERVICES	8
A. Screenings, Treatment, and Alleviation	9
B. Education and Nutrition	9
VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT	10
VII. PARENT INVOLVEMENT	11
VIII. SUMMARY	13

APPENDICES

A. Observation, Development, Achievement Data

B. Social Services

C. Psychological Services

D. Health Services

E. Staff Development

GET SET DAY CARE SUMMARY REPORT 1977-1978

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1977-1978 the Get Set Day Care Program completed its eighth year of funding under the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Title XX of the Amended Social Securities Act. It has always been partially funded by the School District of Philadelphia and was the School District's Head Start program for four years prior to 1969.

The program operated in 76 sites this past year (a reduction of 16 sites from the previous year), and served 4,200 children (approximately) between the ages of three through sixteen -- primarily three to five year olds. The sites were open each week day between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m.

The program was designed to provide child care services to low income families: 1) to enable parents or other caretakers of children to work, receive employment related training or education, or social or health services; 2) to provide children, including the developmentally handicapped, with individualized care which would contribute toward their development and self-sufficiency; and 3) to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests or to preserve, rehabilitate or re-unite families. For the purposes of this report, the various aspects of the program were considered under the headings of Child Development, Social Services, Psychological Services, Health Services (including Nutrition Services), Staff Development, and Parent Involvement.

The body of the report is separated into discussions regarding each of the above six components, while the appendices provide the major supporting data pertinent to the Get Set Day Care Program taken from Early Childhood Evaluation Unit (ECEU) component reports, or supplementary data. The component reports were developed and written by various members of the ECEU staff, recognition of whom is given in the Acknowledgments. The appendices also contain copies of instrumentation not included in previous years' reports, including revised instruments.

II. CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation of the Child Development component of the program was divided into three areas: Classroom Observation Data, Developmental Status of present participants, and School Achievement Data of past participants.

A. Classroom Observation Data

This is a brief overview of empirical, descriptive data of the program obtained through observations of twelve centers. The Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF), in use since 1974-1975, was used to determine the major type of activity, the developmental emphasis within activity types, and the adult roles utilized in the program.

The PKOF showed that observers of Get Set most often saw Free Play time (39%), then Structured Activities (35%), Routines (20%), and Outdoor Play (5%). Compared to other programs (See Appendix A, Table 1) this was a median amount of time spent in each type of activity, and thus was considered a balanced distribution of effort.

Regarding the Developmental Emphasis within the activities, Social Interaction Rapport was reported at a 66% level, thus indicating a high degree of opportunity for children to interact with each other during the program time. (Each area of Developmental Emphasis theoretically could have received an emphasis of 100%, since they are not mutually exclusive.) Language Vocabulary was observed at an emphasis level of 37%, and Fine Motor Manipulation was almost the same at 36%. Gross Motor development was observed at a level of 32%, Social Responsibility Self Help

at a level of 22%, Ideation Math-Logic at a level of 11%, and Fine Motor Draw/Write at a level of 4%.

Relative to other programs, the observed Dévelopmental Emphasis in the children's activities was high regarding Language Vocabulary and Gross Motor and at the median regarding Fine Motor Manipulation and Fine Motor Draw/Write. The program was observed emphasizing Ideation Math-Logic less than in other programs. (These relative comparisons are presented in Appendix A, Table 2.)

Adult roles were also observed and identified according to various modes of teacher interactions and activities with children (see Appendix A, Table 3). Presented in the order of degree of use, the roles were Structurer, Direct Teacher, Indirect Teacher, Enforcer, Story Teller/Song Leader, and Nurturer. Relative to other programs, moderate emphasis was placed upon the first three roles, while Story Teller/Song Leader and Nurturer were relatively low, and Enforcer was relatively high.

Though there are some slight variations, no particular role or Developmental Emphasis, in comparison to other programs, appears to predominate. It is concluded that the profile of the Get Set curriculum and interaction presents a balanced developmental program through moderate amounts of structuring, teaching, and modeling behavior on the part of the adults.

B. Developmental Status of Present Participants

This subsection discusses the overall status of the children's development as reported on completed Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) forms by Get Set staff.

Possibly because the Get Set participants accounted for the largest portion of the total prekindergarten population, no differences between the average developmental status of each of the three age groups in Get Set and the total population's three age groups was found. Within the program each older age group did have an average developmental status in every developmental area higher than the next younger age group, thus supporting general developmental growth expectancies (see Appendix A, Table 4).

Eighteen percent (646 children) of Get Set's population were determined to evidence developmental delay based upon the DBC results. This characterization was based upon a child's developmental score falling below the 25th percentile in each of the three major areas of motor, social, and cognitive development. (The motor area included Gross Motor, Fine Motor Manipulation, and Fine Motor Writing. The social area included Social and Self Help, while cognitive included Cognitive and Language subsections.) The percentage of children evidencing developmental delay was essentially the same as that for all programs combined. (Since this was the first year Get Set used the DBC, and because only Spring data were gathered, the information regarding developmental delay was not used by Psychological Services.)

C. School Achievement Data for Past Participants

Get Set children who entered Kindergarten and continued schooling in the public schools were tracked each year through the Early Childhood File system. Each year all Get Set Program graduates who participated in the City Wide Testing program could be compared to the total population of school children or other sub-groups. In 1977-1978 the percentages of children below the sixteenth percentile rank were compared at grades Kindergarten, One, Two, and Three in the areas of reading and mathematics. Four or more percentage point differences were used to judge real differences among the comparison percentages. Get Set children exceeded Total City comparisons in Kindergarten, One, and Three in reading on the 50th percentile comparisons, and exceeded Total City in second grade also, but only by three percentage points. On the 16th percentile comparisons, Get Set had to its advantage, a lower percentage of children in that level at every grade, but the differences did not satisfy the criterion. In mathematics, Get Set children surpassed or equalled the Total City groups, but met the criterion of difference in grade one only. Thus it may be said for the 1977-1978 school year that Get Set experience definitely had a beneficial effect on children's later reading achievement but such benefit was not as pronounced in the area of mathematics achievement.

III. SOCIAL SERVICES

Data about the status of this component have been obtained from forms used by the Get Set Day Care service workers. Since the forms do not have a one-to-one correspondence with the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit's forms used in other programs, some questions posed generally could not be addressed. The data covers October 1977 through June 1978 and represent 95% of the possible reports. The information describes contacts regarding

intake, services to families and children, meetings, parent involvement, and volunteer services for 62 social workers who work with the 76 centers.

A. Social Worker Contacts and Services

The social workers made 58,919 contacts with families, program staff, and community agencies. Of these, 6,109 (10%) were related to the intake process focused upon the admission phase. Of the contacts, 27 were related to the recruitment phase and 489 were contacts made to community agencies. Each staff member made an average of 98 intake related contacts. The data were similar this year to that of the previous year, showing program consistency.

Six other service categories were reported upon, wherein 3% of the contacts were made regarding attendance, physical health, mental health, family problems, home-program liaison and general information. The remainder of the contacts, 87%, were not specifically identified. The primary mode of contact was through conferences held with program staff (39%), parent conferences at the center (28%), and phone conferences with parents (21%).

B. Other Functions

Each social worker also was involved in an average of eight parent involvement activities during the nine month interval. There were monthly parent meetings, parent projects (not fund raising) and planning sessions for parent activities which accounted for 91% of the meetings involving parents and social workers.

IV. PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

The psychological component was staffed by two school psychologists and an assistant. They reported their activities on a form designed by

ECEU called "Summary of Guidance and Psychological Services -- including Speech and Hearing." The summary represented the work done between October 1977 and June 1978.

A total of 303 children were referred to psychological services during the year. Of these, a total of 257 children were observed or screened for services. Eight percent (31) of the children did not require further service. Of those 236 children, 78% were referred to community health and mental health agencies, and 58% of those continued to receive follow-up services during the year. A total of 171 children received follow-up services by the component staff during the year.

Of the 236 children, 134 had a single handicapping condition, while 102 had multiple handicaps. The most common handicap was social-emotional (47%). Developmental delay (not determined through the DBC because it was not used as a screening device during the year) represented 25% of the handicapping conditions, while speech/language/hearing difficulties were 21%, and mental retardation was 21%. Suspected child abuse and neglect (SCAN) and medical/physical problems were less frequent.

Approximately 20% of the number of handicapping conditions were resolved. The condition most often resolved was developmental delay, with one in three no longer requiring special services by the end of the year. Other conditions were resolved at a rate less than one in four.

V. HEALTH SERVICES

The objectives of the Health Services component were the "identification, correction, and alleviation of health problems, correction, and utilization of health agencies, and the provision of health education and nutritional services to the children admitted into the program." These services were administered by housekeepers, cooks, health education specialists, and health coordinator.

As part of the eligibility assessment for entry into Get Set, the staff completed 5,600 health intakes and 4,600 immunization surveys. The health intakes served as the foundation for the children's permanent school medical records. They were reviewed twice a year, and referrals were made when any problems were identified.

A. Screenings, Treatment, and Alleviation

Of the 4,200 children (average enrollment), 76% (2795) were eligible for Title XIX Farly Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program (EPSDT). However, 59% of the children were examined by private physicians, 476 of whom received further treatment for identified problems. All but 5% of the children had vision screening through the program, 8% were screened for speech and hearing problems, 81% for growth progress, and 43% for dental problems.

Of the thirteen major health categories, problems primarily identified were in the areas of vision (29%), weight (22%), chest (usually asthma, 14%), and skin (eczema or dermatitis, 13%). Treatment was undertaken at clinics for 345 children, at private agencies for 82 children, and in other settings for 31 children.

B. Education and Nutrition

An extensive dental health education program and many parent meetings were a major part of the health education program. Further, breakfasts, lunches, and snacks meeting federal standards were provided regularly for the children.

VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

A survey of a sample of the caregiving staff was conducted in Spring of 1978. Twenty-three teachers, 46 assistant teachers, and six aides completed the survey form. In addition, all supervisors were asked to complete a similar form. For the purposes of this summary, assistant teachers and aides were treated a single category labeled "AT/A" below.

According to the data, 80% of the caregiving staff had five or more years of experience in early childhood education, most of which was acquired in the Get Set Day Care Program. Teachers indicated that they were satisfied with ten listed supervisory services except for on-site classroom training. AT/A's were even more satisfied with their supervisor's services, including the on-site training. Both groups were particulary satisfied with the parent involvement support offered by the supervisors.

Teachers indicated that they had received slightly more on-site demonstrations/teaching assistance this year compared to the previous year, but for about a third of the teachers there had been none. AT/A's indicated that there was slightly less on-site demonstrations/assistance this year than the previous, and about two-fifths had none. Supervisors, on the other hand, indicated that they had visited and worked with each teacher a minimum of six times on the average during the year, and that on-site development was provided more frequently than last year.

Staff development topics were viewed by both groups as contributing moderately to their classroom effectiveness. Twenty-two percent of the teachers responded that "suspected child abuse and neglect" topics had the most effect on their effectiveness. About one-third of the AT/A's tended to rate "improving basic skills or basic skills readiness," "using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum," "classroom management," and making effective use of physical space" as having a great impact on their effectiveness.

Less than half of the teachers indicated that they would participate in staff development sessions without reimbursement, but in selected areas, more than half of the AT/A group would do so. Particularly, they were interested in the use of the creative arts for curriculum enrichment. Future staff development topics most desired for both groups were on the topics of social behaviors and improving the basic skills. Supervisors were in agreement with this selection according to their responses.

VII. PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Fifty-one sites returned a questionnaire regarding parent involvement activities (67% of all the Get Set sites). These returns indicated that the Get Set parent groups tended to view their planning emphases in the following order; fund raising, social activities, educational sessions, educational activities for children, and last, policy and budget decisions. In this regard, the order of planning emphasis, the Get Set group was similar to the Home and School Associations of other program sites without special program-specific parent groups.

Get Set reported 87% of its parents had attended one or more meetings,

activities, or workshops during the year. This was the best percentage for all the programs except for two, one of which required parent participation and the other which was a one-site project.

The average "volunteers per family" figure for activities in Get Set was 1.69 (the third highest among ten programs). Volunteers helped most in fund raising (31%) and next most on class trips. Twelve to 15% helped in each area designated Work done at home, Classroom participation, and Other. The hours spent per volunteer was an average of eight (fifth highest among the ten programs). Most time (29%) was spent on class trips, fund-raising activities (25%), and classroom help (23%). Non-day care programs tended to have most time spent in classroom participation, but a day care program's parents are evidently less available during the day.

The Get Set program provided for an average of 4.76 (approximately 5) workshops per site for parents. The average per program was approximately ten per site with a range from one to twenty-one. Most of the workshops in Get Set were categorized as Educational (32%), Personal Growth and Development (21%), Social Services (14%), Other (14%), and Policy Planning (13%).

VIII. SUMMARY

The Get Set Day Care Program was found, through observation data, to provide a balance of activity time for Free Play, Structured Activities, and Routines. Compared to other programs, there was a moderate amount of Outdoor Play time, even though this was observed less than the other three types of activities. The activities primarily tended to support the development of children's social skill, language, fine motor manipulation, large muscle, and social responsibility. The developmental measure of the children showed them to be, on the average, equal to all the program's children. Post program tests (school achievement tests in reading and mathematics) showed that Get Set children had advantages in reading achievement compared to the total population of school children in grades Kindergarten through Three. Mathematics achievement comparisons did not evidence any clear advantage to Get Set children this year.

The major function of the social workers as determined by type and proportions of contacts could not be accurately determined. However, an analysis of contacts which were specified showed the focus to be largely upon intake (admission) procedures. Well over a third of the contacts were made with program staff, while parents were contacted through conferences at the center and over the phone, which accounted for 50% of the social worker contacts. Each social worker attended, on the average, about one parent meeting a month.

Three hundred three children were referred to the psychologists for observation and screening, and 257 were actually observed or screened. Eight percent required no further service. Of the remaining 236 children, 171 received follow-up services from the staff during the year, 78% were referred to community or mental health agencies. One hundred thirty-four

had a single handicapping condition while 102 had multiple handicaps. The most common handicap fell into the category of social-emotional problems (47%). Developmental delay accounted for 25% of the conditions, while speech and hearing (21%) and mental retardation (21%) were the next most prevalent problems.

The Health Services component has been consistent from year to year, and has again provided screenings for the program population and attempted to assure that identified problems were remediated. It also has provided health education through parent workshop. A related service, nutrition, has also been provided by the program by serving food to children which met federal minumum requirements.

Staff development was provided through supervisors who were in regular contact with each staff member. The staff was generally satisfied with the services they received, except that they would prefer more in-class training. Many respondents reported that they had received no training of that sort, and they desired it. Staff development concerning basic skill and social skills continued to be desired topics for future staff development.

Parent Involvement in Get Set tended to be higher than for school-age programs but parents (possibly because they were unavailable during the day) tended to spend time in meetings rather than helping in the classroom, as in other preschool programs. Their support was focused more upon fund raising activities and participation in parent meetings.

By and large, the Get Set Day Care Program in 1977-1978 appeared to be functioning well in relation to its goals, and to be preparing children for later school achievement, especially in reading.

APPENDIX A

Tables 1-3 PK of (Observation) Data

Table 4 DBC Data

Table 5 Post Program Achievement Data

TABLE 1

1977-1978 GET SET DAY CARE
DISTRIBUTION OF KINDS OF ACTIVITY PERIODS
BASED ON PKOF DATA FOR 1977-1978

Type	Program	COMPARISON DATA		
		Low	Median	High
Free Play	39%	20%	44%	54%
Structured Activity	35%	29%	37%	47%
Routines	20%	13%	18%	24%
Outdoor Play	5%	0%	5%	13%

TABLE 2

1977-1978 GET SET DAY CARE
DEVELOPMENTAL EMPHASIS AS DETERMINED
THROUGH OBSERVATION DATA

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITY CATEGORIES	PROGRAM'S AVERAGE EMPHASIS	COMPARISON DATA		
		Low	Median	High
GROSS MOTOR	26%	12%	23%	32%
FINE MOTOR MANIPULATION	20%	11%	23%	36%
FINE MOTOR DRAW/WRITE	9%	2%	4%	9%
SOCIAL INTERACTION/ RAPPORT	64%	52%	61%	66%
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY/ SELF-HELP	27%	14%	25%	31%
IDEATION--MATH/LOGIC	13%	11%	19%	39%
LANGUAGE/VOCABULARY	33%	31%	38%	47%

Each Developmental Activity Category could (potentially) have been rated at 100%, meaning that all of the children for all of the observation time were involved in activities supporting that category of development. The degree to which the number of children and the amount of time were utilized in a given category of development is reflected by the percentage of emphasis.

TABLE 3

1977-1978 GET SET DAY CARE
CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN

INTERACTION CATEGORY	PROGRAM INDEX	COMPARISON INDICES		
		Low	Median	High
STRUCTURER Adult with Group Adult Led Group Directed (Procedural)	42	36	42	52
STORY TELLER/SONG LEADER Reading/Singing/ Telling Story	8	8	14	18
DIRECT TEACHER Showed The Children Instructed (Knowledge) Questioned (Closed) Approved Behavior	20	11	19	26
INDIRECT TEACHER Social Talk Played/Worked Along Suggested Questioned (Open)	18	7	18	23
NURTURER Got Things for Child Reflected Child's Feelings Physically Nurtured Shared Thoughts	5	5	7	8
ENFORCER Limited/Compelled Physically Restrained Dissapproved Behavior	9	3	7	10

The Program Index for each Interaction Category (e.g., STRUCTURER) is the average percentage of observations in which any item in the category occurred. The size of one Program Index may be compared to any other. Three Comparison Indices are provided for each Interaction Category so that the relationship of the given program can be found with regard to all six programs studied. The six programs included are Child Care, Durham and Douglass, Get Set Day Care, Prekindergarten Head Start, Parent Cooperative Nurseries, and Impact Aid Preschool Project.

TABLE 4

GET SET DAY CARE

AVERAGE NUMBER OF ITEMS ACCOMPLISHED ON
THE DBC 1977-1978

Name of Subsection	AGE GROUP 1*		AGE GROUP 2*		AGE GROUP 3*	
	Get Set N=1026	Total Pre K N=1350	Get Set N=1133	Total Pre K N=1692	Get Set N=1406	Total Pre K N=2069
Gross Motor (20 items)	11.8	11.9	15.5	15.4	17.0	16.9
Fine Motor Manipulation (14 items)	8.4	8.5	10.8	10.9	12.1	12.1
Fine Motor Writing (28 items)	9.7	9.9	15.9	16.2	20.3	20.3
Social Skills (21 items)	10.0	10.6	12.8	13.6	14.4	15.1
Self Help (21 items)	14.6	14.7	17.8	17.9	19.1	19.1
Cognitive (45 items)	20.1	20.3	28.7	29.2	33.4	33.9
Language (24 items)	11.8	12.2	15.0	15.5	16.7	17.0

*Age Group	Birthdate	Age as of May 1, 1978
1	May, 1974 - June, 1975	35-48 months
2	September., 1973 - April, 1974	49-56 months
3	July, 1972 - Aug., 1973	57-70 months

TABLE 5

ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS OF GET SET DAY CARE
POST PROGRAM CHILDREN AND OF "TOTAL CITY"
FOR KINDERGARTEN AND GRADES ON, TWO, AND THREE
IN READING AND MATHEMATICS 1977-1978

Group	Number Kinder.	Percent 16th*	Percent 50th	Number First	Percent 16th	Percent 50th	Number Second	Percent 16th	Percent 50th	Number Third	Percent 16th	Percent 50th
Reading			**									
Get Set Graduates	1,078	3%	84%	1,237	5%	67%	840	8%	62%	609	13%	49%
Total City	15,929	4%	80%	16,056	8%	60%	16,520	9%	59%	15,843	17%	44%
Mathematics												
Get Set Graduates	1,077	9%	69%	1,246	5%	65%	843	9%	59%	612	13%	55%
Total City	15,933	10%	70%	16,196	9%	61%	16,573	9%	59%	15,861	15%	53%

* The headings 16th and 50th stand for the percentage of children who were:

a) below the 16th percentile score and b) at or above the 50th percentile score.

** The percentages underlined are those for which four or more percentage points difference was noted by comparison, and the underlined percentage is the favored one. For "below the 16th percentile score" columns, the favored is the lower of the two percentages, while for "at or above the 50th percentile score" columns, the favored is the higher of the two.

APPENDIX B

SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT REPORT

GET SET DAY CARE APPENDIX

SOCIAL SERVICES IN
GET SET DAY CARE

Get Set Day Care (GS) was funded by Title XX under the Ammended Social Security Act of 1975. It was designed to provide child care services to low-income families for three basic purposes: 1) to enable parents or other caretakers of children to work, receive employment related training or education, or to receive social or health services; 2) to provide children, including those developmentally handicapped, with individualized care which would contribute toward the child's development and self-sufficiency; and 3) to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests, or to preserve, rehabilitate, or reunite families.[1]

Get Set Day Care provided five major services (Education, Health, Nutrition, Psychological and Social Services). This report focuses on social services which were available to families who requested or were identified as being in need of assistance from the Get Set Day Care social service workers (SSW) in 1977-1978. The social service component attempted to meet the needs of families requesting assistance through the integration of day care services with both private and public educational, health and social welfare agencies. Services included intake, explanation and interpretation of policies, and referral and counseling services. Collectively, the SSWs assured a degree of coordination and continuity in services to families.

To obtain information on social services, ECEU developed a cross-program (i.e., to be utilized in four Early Childhood Programs) Social Services Reporting Form. In 1977-78, however, GS was unable to provide its data on this form because to do so would have required a duplication of reporting

[1] Pennsylvania Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 26, pgs. 1365, 1392.

efforts by the SSW. Data pertaining to social services, therefore, were obtained from the forms previously utilized by the SSW. The data obtained for this report spanned from October, 1977 to June, 1978 and was based on 95% of the GS's Personal Monthly Report Form.

Get Set Day Care employed 62 social service workers to directly assist approximately 3500 families with 4265 children enrolled monthly in 76 day care centers.[1] Social Services and the SSWs' activities will be presented as follows: I. Specific Intake Activities and Services to Children and Families Enrolled, II. Meetings With a Direct Involvement of Social Service Workers, III. Attainment of Internal Operating of Objectives, IV. Social Service Workers' Participation in Parent Involvement and Volunteer Service Activities, and V. Summary and Conclusion.

I. Specific Intake Activities/Services to Children and Families

The SSWs made a total of 58,919 contacts with families, program personnel and community agencies during the program year. Of that total, 10.4% (6109) were related to the programs' intake process of admission and recruitment. Ninety-two percent (5596) of the intake-related contacts were held with parents or guardians. The remaining 8% (513) were held with representatives of community agencies. The number of contacts held with program personnel and related to the intake process were unavailable due to the different recording procedure required on the Get Set and ECEU's form.

Seven pre-identified areas of assistance were specified [2] to ascertain

[1] The number of children was based on the average monthly enrollment figures for January-March 1978. The estimated number of families was derived from taking a percentage (82.5%) of the total number of children enrolled.

[2] The 7 pre-identified needs as shown on Table I, were listed on ECEU's cross-program form. As GS data were not reported on ECEU's form, in order to make the required cross-program Early Childhood Report, GS's data were transposed to ECEU's form.

the types of services provided by the SSWs to children and families. Table I shows the purpose of the interactions between the SSWs and families, program personnel or community agencies. The data indicated that 2.7% of the SSWs' contacts were held for the purposes identified under categories 1-6, 10.3% in category 7, and 87% in category 8 or unspecified. Because so many contacts were classified as unspecified, the purposes of the SSWs' interactions could not be determined. However, the SSW's methods of interaction were available.

Table II shows the SSWs' methods of contacts with the families, program personnel and community agencies for both 1976-77 and 1977-78 program years. (Data for 1976-77 has been presented for comparative purposes.) Although the 1976-77 data were based on a ten month reporting period, there were more contacts undertaken during the nine months of reporting services for the 1977-78 program year. The proportion of contacts with families, community agencies and program staff were similar in both years; therefore, the data suggest that the SSWs' methods of assisting families may be fairly consistent from year to year.

II. Meeting With a Direct Involvement of Social Service Workers

Table III shows the number and types of meetings attended by SSWs. On the average, each SSW attended 31 meetings during the program year. Approximately one-half of the meetings were held with program personnel, one-fourth with parent-related meetings and the remaining one-fourth for staff development and other activities. The data suggest that SSW attended meetings primarily to discuss program operations or to participate in parent-related activities.

TABLE I

PURPOSE OF CONTACTS BY
SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS TO ASSIST FAMILIES

NUMBER	Purpose of Contacts	SERVICE WORKER'S CONTACTS WITH FAMILIES OR AGENCIES							
		Families Parent, Guardian or Child		Community Agencies Sharing-Exchanging Information Including Referrals		Conferences With Program Personnel Including Referrals		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Child's Attendance	343	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	343	.6
2	Child's Physical Health	42	.1	8	.2	511	2.2	561	1.0
3	Child's Mental Health	0	.0	13	.4	169	.7	182	.3
4	Family Dsyfunctioning	19	.1	261	7.7	0	0.0	280	.5
5	Program Information Home School Liaison	165	.5	11	.3	0	0.0	176	.3
6	Information About Community Agencies	0	.0	22	.7	0	0.0	22	.0
7	Intake Activity Admission/Recruitment	5596	17.2	513	15.2	0	0.0	6109	10.3
8	Unspecified	26,259	81.0	2555	75.5	22,432	97.1	51246	87.0
	Total	32,424 (55.0)	100.0	3383 (5.7)	100.0	23,112 (39.2)	100.0	58919	100.0

TABLE II

METHODS OF CONTACTS BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS TO ASSIST FAMILIES

Types of Contacts	PROGRAM YEAR*			
	1976 - 1977		1977 - 1978	
Family:				
Phone Contacts	12431	23.8	12585	21.4
Home Visits	1180	2.3	1015	1.7
Parent Conferences	16176	31.0	16672	28.3
Child's Observations	1379	2.6	2152	3.7
Community Agencies:				
Contacts Other Than Referrals	1592	3.0	2249	3.8
Referrals	344	.7	1134	1.9
Program Personnel:				
Conferences of Staff	18609	35.6	22432	38.1
Referrals Within Program	507	1.0	680	1.1
Total	52218	100.0	58919	100.0

* Data for 1976-1977 reflects 10 months' of services and 1977-1978 reflects 9 months' of services.

TABLE III

MEETINGS DIRECTLY INVOLVING GET SET SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

TYPES OF MEETINGS	NUMBER	PERCENT
Meetings with parents (PTC, Area and Center Council)	507	26.2
Meetings with Program personnel (Unit, lead teacher and Social Services)	926	47.8
Staff Development	334	17.2
Other (e.g., Title XX Hearing, student evaluation)	170	8.8
Total For All Social Service Workers/Year	1937	100.0
Total Per Social Worker/Year	31	

III. Attainment of Internal Operating Objectives

Table IV presents information regarding the attainment of five objectives established by the Social Services component. These objectives were related to the internal operating functions of Social Services. The reported activities indicated that two of five objectives were attained and three were not attained by the target date set by the component.

TABLE IV

ATTAINMENT OF INTERNAL OPERATING OBJECTIVES[1]
1977-1978

---

1) OBJECTIVE: To finalize by September 1, 1978 a comprehensive Outreach Plan developed through the cooperation of the socail service staff with the related component and administrative/supervisory staff to elicit greater service needs response from families and agencies.

FINDING: The Outreach Plan had not yet been developed by June 1978.

---

2) OBJECTIVE: Beginning September 1, 1977 a program to encourage larger enrollments of schoolage children will be initiated by Social Services and Program Administration. (Success of this effort will be measured by a 5% increase of enrollment of schoolage children over the 76-77 figure.)

FINDING: Based on the information obtained from the Get Set monthly reports, the average schoolage enrollment in 1976-77 was 101. A 5% increase would have meant that an additional 5 children would be enrolled over the 1976-1977 enrollment figure of 101, that is, 106 children enrolled. The average schoolage enrollment in 1977-78 was 90 children.

---

3) OBJECTIVE: During the ten month period beginning September 1977, six (6) workshops will be held for field social service staff who missed the 1976-1977 workshop on case recording techniques.

FINDING: Twenty-five social service workers attended six sessions, each three hours in length, of the case recording technique workshop. These sessions were held from October 19, 1977 through November 23, 1977.

---

4) OBJECTIVE: Between September 1, 1977 and June 30, 1978 a series of six (6) workshops using audio-visual aids and techniques will be held in each social service area to improve staff skills in proper interviewing techniques.

FINDING: Seventy-four social service personnel and nine nurses attended six (6) sessions, each three hours in length, of the interviewing technique workshop. Fifty-nine persons (71%) completed an 8 questions evaluation form. Almost all found the sessions helpful, especially in dealing with cultural differences and non-verbal clients. Respondents stated that they were feeling more comfortable about undertaking an interview and better able to elicit more information from the client, thereby, becoming more sensitive to client's expressed and unexpressed needs.

---

5) OBJECTIVE: In order to develop a more adequate information and referral system for social service workers and their clients, the social service administrative/supervisory personnel will take leadership in developing, by April 1, 1978, a loose-leaf, three-ring binder of referral resources to be used by individual social workers.

FINDINGS: The loose-lead folder had not been completed as of June 1, 1978.

IV. Social Service Workers Participation in Parent Involvement and Volunteer Service Activities

Social Service workers were also responsible for engaging in parent involvement and volunteer service activities. Table V presents the number and types of parent and volunteer activities involving the SSWs. On the average, each SSW was active in 8 parent or volunteer activities during the year. The primary areas of SSW's involvement were monthly parent meetings

TABLE V

SOCIAL WORKER'S PARTICIPATION IN
PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTEER SERVICES ACTIVITIES

TYPE OF ACTIVITIES	NUMBER	PERCENT
Monthly Parent Meetings	181	39.1
Engaging in Parent Projects	132	28.5
Planning Sessions for Parent Activities	108	23.3
Fund Raising	31	6.7
Recruitment of Parent or Volunteers	11	2.4
Total For All Social Service Workers/Year	463	100.0
Total Per Social Service Worker/Year	8	

(39%), parent projects (28%) and planning sessions for parent activities (23%).[1]

V. Summary and Conclusion

Cummulative data from 1977-78 show that GS's 62 SSWs initiated 58,919 contacts, and that these contacts were held primarily with parents or guardians of children enrolled in GS. The SSWs also participated in 1937 meetings (including 463 parent and volunteer activities). Due to the different methods of data collection and analyses, specific figures related to the purpose of the SSW's interaction with a family, program personnel or representative of community agency were not available. However, SSWs methods of contact were available and their modes of contacts paralled for both 1976-77 and 1977-78 program years.

The SSWs' participation in parent involvement and volunteer service activities were primarily held in the form of attending monthly parent meetings, attending parent planning sessions for parent projects and engaging in parent projects. Other meetings SSWs attended focused on issues or procedures regarding daily center operations. While the data indicated that a great deal of activity was generated in the social service area, references related to the component across programs could not be made because different methods were utilized to collect the data in the Get Set Day Care Program. In order to align the data collection procedures and analyses for the 1978-1979 program year, GS should expand its monthly reporting form to allow the reporting of pertinent information related to the areas of social services under examination by ECEU for Early Childhood Programs.

[1]Additional information may be obtained by referring to the Study of Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Programs, ORE Report No. 7912.

APPENDIX C

PSYCHOLOGOCAL SERVICES COMPONENT REPORT

GET SET DAY CARE APPENDIX

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES
IN GET SET DAY CARE

Get Set Day Care (GS) is funded by Title XX under the Ammended Social Security Act of 1975. It is designed to provide child care services to low-income families: 1) to enable parents or other caretakers of children to work, to receive employment-related training or education, or to receive social or health services; 2) to provide children, including the developmentally handicapped, with individualized care which will contribute toward the child's development and self-sufficiency; and 3) to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interest, or to preserve, rehabilitate or reunite families.[1]

Get Set Day Care provided services in five areas: Education, Health, Nutrition, Psychological and Social Services to approximately 4265 children monthly.[2] Information concerning services rendered from the Psychological component will focus on direct services to the program participants. Indirect mental health service provisions, that is, planning and in-service training for GS personnel and workshops for parents will not be discussed. Information related to Staff Development, Health Services, and Parent Involvement in GS may be obtained by referring to the annual Get Set report prepared by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit.

---

[1] Pennsylvania Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 26, June 19, 1976, pgs. 1365, 1392.

[2] Average enrollment figure is based on January-March 1978 enrollment figures.

The activities undertaken by the Psychological Services component will be presented in the following sequence: 1) the number of children observed or screened for services, 2) the types of problem areas identified, 3) the number of consultations undertaken by the mental health staff to assist children in the program year, and 4) a summary of the above information.

The Psychological component was comprised of two school psychologists and an assistant. The staff's combined activities were reported on a Summary of Guidance and Psychological Services - Including Speech and Hearing - Form designed by ECEU. Data encompassed two reporting periods and each period was designed to cover five months. However, due to a program reorganization and delay in certification of eligible children from the County Board of Assistance, the first reporting period (P_1) was a summary of activities from October 1977 to January 1978, and the second period (P_2) encompassed activities from February 1978 through the end of June 1978..

I. CHILDREN OBSERVED OR SCREENED

A total of 303 children were referred to the psychological component during the program year. In P_1, 180 children were referred; 83.3% (150) of the children were observed or screened while the remaining 16.7% (30) were awaiting review for services. In P_2, 123 children were referred, and of this number, 87% (107) were observed or screened while 13% (16) remained pending for review. A total of 257 children were observed or screened for services during both reporting periods. This number constitutes 6.0% of the children enrolled monthly in Get Set.

Once the 257 children were observed or screened for mental health services, it was determined that 21 (8%) children did not require psychological intervention services. The remaining 236 (92%) children were provided services by the GS

psychological staff with 177 (75.3%) children receiving services throughout the year. Forty-nine (20.8%) children did not require the GS staff's attention throughout the year. In addition, 78 (33.1%) of the 236 children obtained services from community mental health agencies.

II. TYPES OF PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

Of the 236 children identified with a handicapping condition, approximately 134 (57%) children had a single handicapping condition while 102 (43%) children had multiple handicaps. Table I shows seven problem areas identified by the psychological staff and the number of children with each handicapped condition.

During the year, the most common handicapping condition was social-emotional adjustment (46.6%). This was followed by children who were developmentally delayed (25%), those with speech/language hearing difficulities (21%), and the mentally retarded (20.8%). Less frequent problem areas identified were suspected child abuse and neglect (SCAN), neurological involvement and medical/physical conditions.

Approximately 20% of the number of handicapping conditions were resolved in each of the reporting periods. One in four children with neurological involvement, one in five with mental retardation and one in five with suspected child abuse and neglect did not require further attention at the end of each period. The handicapping condition with the highest percentage of service completion was developmental delay, with one in three no longer requiring services within a reporting period. Alternatively, health conditions with less than 20% of service completion during each period were speech/language/hearing handicaps, social-emotional adjustment and medical/physical handicaps.

TABLE I

TYPES OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS IDENTIFIED

N = 236

Handicapping Conditions	FIRST FOUR MONTHS October 1977— January 1978			SECOND FIVE MONTHS February 1978 - June 1978			NINE MONTH PERIOD October 1977— June 1978			
	Active	Inactive	Total	Active	Inactive	Total	Active	Inactive	Total	
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		%
Mental Retardation	22	5	27	17	5	22	39	10	49	20.8
Developmentally Delayed	21	13	34	18	7	25	39	20	59	25.0
Neurological Involvement	7	3	10	8	2	10	15	5	20	8.5
Medical/Physical	3	0	3	4	0	4	7	0	7	3.0
Social-Emotional	42	6	48	50	12	62	92	18	110	46.6
Speech/Language/ Hearing	28	4	32	18	0	18	46	4	50	21.2
Suspected Child Abuse & Neglect	14	3	17	17	5	22	31	8	39	16.5

C-4

III. NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS WITH PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Consultations with children were generally held to screen children or to provide short-term counseling. Contacts with parents were to obtain further information about the child or to share the child's educational play with parents. Consultations with staff included follow-up on referrals and assisting teachers in developing an Individual Educational Prescription (IEP) for each special needs child.

Table II shows the number of contacts with children, parents, and staff, by problem areas, which was reported by the psychological staff. It also presents the ratio of consultations held with each group. On the average, there were nine consultations held with or for each child. Overall, 32% of the consultations were held with children, 14% were held with parents, and the remaining 54% were held with the program staff and others.

TABLE II

CONSULTATIONS MADE WITH CHILDREN, PARENTS, AND PROGRAM STAFF AND OTHERS BY THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STAFF

Purpose of Contacts	OCTOBER 1977 - JUNE 1978							
	Children		Parent or Guardian		Program Staff and Others		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mental Retardation	115	17.3	85	28.1	207	18.2	407	19.3
Developmentally Delayed	115	17.3	49	16.2	208	18.2	372	17.7
Neurological Involvement	46	6.9	16	5.3	68	6.0	130	6.2
Medical/Physical	18	2.7	4	1.3	29	2.5	51	2.4
Social-Emotional	218	32.8	94	31.1	344	30.2	656	31.1
Speech/Language/Hearing	106	15.9	45	14.9	182	16.0	333	15.8
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN)	47	7.1	9	3.0	102	8.9	158	7.5
Total	665	100.0	302	99.9	1140	100.1	2107	100.0
Ratio of Contacts	1:2.8		1:1.3		1:4.8		1:8.9	

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Observation and screening services were provided to 257 children (6.0% of the program's average enrollment), and of these, 236 (91.8%) children received psychological intervention services. Approximately 20% of the special conditions of singular or multiple handicapped children were resolved within each reporting period. The most common special needs area was social-emotional adjustment. This was followed by developmentally delayed children and children with mental retardation and speech/language/hearing difficulties. Less frequent were suspected child abuse and neglect (SCAN), medical/physical, and neurological involvement disabilities. This pattern was similar for both reporting periods. There were an average of nine consultations conducted for each child referred to the component. More than one-half of all consultations were held with program personnel, about one-third with children, and the remaining one-sixth with parents.

The focus of this report has been on direct psychological intervention with children in GS. For the 1978-1979 program year, data collection will be modified to include indirect service provisions to children, that is, psychological service activities that relate to consultations, planning and inservice training with GS personnel and workshops designed for parents. That will be necessary since the psychological staff serves in a resource-consultation capacity to program staff and parents, while treatment or therapy are provided directly by community agencies. By obtaining information on activities indirectly related to families, a more comprehensive perspective on psychological service rendered to families in GS can be presented.

APPENDIX D

HEALTH SERVICES COMPONENT REPORT

GET SET DAY CARE APPENDIX

GET SET DAY CARE
HEALTH SERVICES

The Get Set Day Care Program, a Title XX and Philadelphia School District funded day care program served approximately 4200 children in 76 sites in 1977-78. Get Set program goals are formulated in "consonance with certain overriding objectives established at the Federal level under Title XX, and proposed in the comprehensive social services plan of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.[1]"

The principal objectives related to this report pertain to the "identification, correction and alleviation of health problems, the utilization of health agencies, and the provision of health education and nutritional services to the children admitted in the program." The administration of these services were undertaken by housekeepers, cooks, health education specialists, and a health coordinator.

As part of the eligibility assessment for entry into Get Set Day Care, approximately 5600 health intakes, and 4600 immunization surveys were completed by the staff. Health intakes serve as the foundation for beginning a child's permanent school medical record. These beginning records are reviewed twice a year in the Get Set program for health findings and interpretations. If this review reveals any concerns, referrals are made.

A major focus of the health component of the Get Set Day Care program is the provision of similar services to those given by the Philadelphia School District Health Services Division (i.e., screenings, referrals for treatment and determinance of EPSDT eligibility). Table 1 indicates that a large number of Get Set children had physical exams completed, were EPSDT eligible and had the necessary screenings performed.

[1]Get Set Day Care Program Proposal, July, 1977.

TABLE 1

GET SET DAY CARE
HEALTH SERVICES

Program Enrollment		EPSDT Eligible		Filed Records Of Exams*		COMPLETED SCREENINGS							
						Vision		Speech and Hearing**		Growth		Dental***	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4200	100	2795	76	2491	59	4020	95	358	8	3423	81	1830	43

* Exams are Given by Private Physicians. Evidence of exam completion is filed in child's health Record.

** Number given reflects the total # of speech and hearing screenings.

*** Later data confirm that additional dental screenings were completed on approximately 2500 children.

From the total number of pupils (N=2491) examined by private physicians, 476 were termed "under care." This term indicates that problems of some sort were identified which required further care. Five hundred and eighty-seven problems were diagnosed from the total number of screenings, and physician exams. Table 2 shows the type and number of problems found, treated and terminated.

Thirteen categories of health problems were identified (including "other"), with eye problems, primarily defective vision, representing the greatest number identified (29%). Nutritional, primarily over and underweight--22%, chest, primarily asthma--14%; and skin, primarily eczema or dermatitis--13% problems were also frequently diagnosed. The majority (75%) of children diagnosed with problems other than nutritional ones, received and completed treatment. Three hundred and forty-five cases were provided service at health clinics, 82 at private agencies and 31 in other settings.

TABLE 2

IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

Problem	NUMBER OF PROBLEMS									
	Found Through Screenings		Found By Private Physician		Found By School Physician		Treatment Agency			Terminated[1]
	Found	Treated	Found	Treated	Found	Treated	Private	Clinic	Other	
Eye	95	61	31	29	47	41	30	101	0	131
Nose and Throat	0	0	5	5	1	1	0	6	0	6
Ear	2	2	17	17	5	5	6	18	0	24
Speech	0	0	13	11	35	26	0	32	2	42
Skin	0	0	48	48	30	29	21	56	0	77
Nodes	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
Thyroid Condition	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Chest	0	0	78	81	0	0	16	65	0	83
Orthopedic	0	0	7	7	1	0	1	6	0	7
Nutrition	115	44	6	7	9	6	3	26	28	58
Nervous	0	0	11	11	0	0	1	10	0	4
Hernia	0	0	10	10	1	1	4	8	0	11
Other Conditions	0	0	17	16	1	1	0	15	1	17
TOTAL	212	107	244	243	131	111	82	345	31	427

* Terminated indicates that a problem received all the necessary care and can be termed healed. The number terminated may be higher than those identified. This includes problems which were identified by program staff.

As part of the health service program, nutritional services and health education for children and parents was provided. Data documents an extensive dental health education program and numerous parent meetings.[1] Food services, planned and provided by Get Set staff, assured breakfast, lunch and snack meals which fully met Federal program established standards.

Overall, the Philadelphia Get Set Day Care Program had a very complete health service component for the 1977-78 school year. The material presented suggests that the health component is consistent in the services from year to year, and that there appears to be effort made to see that required services are delivered to, or obtained by, all Get Set children. Get Set not only promotes the viability of the EPSDT program through utilization, but through personnel, provides a program which appears capable of handling most health concerns to the preschool child.

[1] The social services component details information about parent contacts. Information obtained from Get Set Day Care Program staff indicate that 198 classroom dental drills were given, and 32 health programs were provided.

APPENDIX E

STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT REPORT

GET SET DAY CARE APPENDIX

GET SET DAY CARE

This analysis is based on 75 responses from Get Set Day Care staff (23 teachers, 46 assistant teachers and 6 aides). In the following discussion, assistant teacher and aide (AT/A) responses are combined.

Experience

Almost 100% of the teachers had over five years of experience, both in early childhood and in the Get Set Program. Similarly, a major portion (83%) of the AT/A's had over five years experience, not only in early childhood, but in the Get Set Program.

Attendance in Staff Development Sessions

Approximately 75% of the teachers attended workshops this year. The majority of those workshops were provided by the school district.[1] Eighty-three percent had on-site consultations and almost a third had over ten consultations during the course of the year.

Only a small percentage (10%) of the teachers reported that more frequent on-site assistance was provided this year. The majority indicated that the amount of on-site assistance was either the same as last year (35%), or was not received at all (30%).

Approximately 75% of the AT/A's attended workshops this year, 60% of which were provided by the school district. Most (79%) had at least one on-site consultation, but 42% reported that they had no on-site demonstrations or assistance.

[1]This includes staff development provided by program staff.

Satisfaction With Supervisory Support

The teachers appear more than satisfied with the services provided by supervisors, particularly in regard to "parent involvement." The only service where less than fifty percent did not report general satisfaction was "on-site classroom training."

At least half of the AT/A's were satisfied with all ten services provided by supervisors. They were particularly satisfied with support given in: "parent involvement" (79%); "working out concerns with individual children" (77%); and "individual concerns" (75%).

Impact of Staff Development on Classroom Practices

The teachers felt that most areas of staff development listed on the questionnaire resulted in little or moderate change in classroom effectiveness. Twenty-two percent, however, did select "suspect child abuse/neglect" as an area which they felt resulted in greater effectiveness in the classroom.

The AT/A's felt that most areas of staff development resulted in moderate change in classroom effectiveness. Approximately a third, however, felt that "using the creative arts" and "improving the basics" were areas which resulted in greater effectiveness in the classroom.

Non-reimbursed Participation

Less than half of the teachers were willing to participate in any area of staff development listed without reimbursement. "Improving the basics" (43%); "using teacher center facilities" (43%); and "classroom management" (43%) were the only areas where a substantial number of teachers were willing to participate without reimbursement.

AT/A's appear more willing to participate in staff development without reimbursement than teachers. Almost 30% responded that they would do so in all areas listed. Fifty percent were willing to participate without reimbursement in staff development in "the creative arts."

Future Staff Development

The areas of priority for future staff development identified by teachers were: "improving the basics"; "social behaviors"; "creative arts"; "commercial materials"; and "parent involvement."

The AT/A's selected the "creative arts"; "social behaviors"; "improving the basics"; "growth and development"; and "helping children take tests," as their areas of priority.

Staff Development: Supervisor

Get Set Supervisors indicate that staff development is built into the school day, with over 40% of their time spent in direct contact with teachers. Responses suggest that they were responsible for at least 6 centers, and that they visited and worked with each teacher a minimum of six times. They report that generally, on-site staff development was provided more frequently this year than last.

The two areas which received the greatest emphasis were "growth/development issues", and "improving the pre-reading, reading and/or math programs". The areas where all agreed that a great amount of time was spent were "solving classroom management problems" and "giving support to individual concerns".

The supervisors prefer a combination of methods for implementing future staff development, although the workshop was frequently selected. Preferred topics for future staff development were "social behaviors," "improving the

basics," and "individualizing instruction."

Conclusion

Data suggest that Get Set staff are quite experienced. At least 80% of the teachers and AT/A's had over five years of experience, not only in early childhood, but in the Get Set Program.

Most of the staff attended school district sponsored workshops and had at least one on-site consultation during the course of the year. Almost a 'rd of the entire staff reported that no on-site assistance was provided, although teachers did report receiving more than AT/A's.

The staff appears basically satisfied with services provided by supervisors. Parent involvement was ranked particularly high in satisfaction by all. Little or moderate change in classroom effectiveness was felt to have resulted from most areas of staff development provided.

A larger number of AT/A appear more willing than teachers to participate in staff development without reimbursement. They were particularly interested in using the creative arts for curriculum enrichment.

Areas of priority for future staff development selected by both teachers and aides were social behaviors and improving the basics.

Response Comparison

Teachers and AT/A's report receiving more on-site consultations and assistance this year than in the previous year. Satisfaction with services provided by supervisors remains high, particularly as regards support given in parent involvement in both years.

In 1976-77, teachers and AT/A's felt a great number of areas made a change in classroom effectiveness. Their selections this year focused primarily on moderate rankings. Using the creative arts, however, was selected by AT/A's as being particularly effective.

According to 1976-77 data, a willingness was indicated by the entire staff for staff development participation without reimbursement in a number of areas. In 1977-78, fewer staff members appear to be willing to participate in staff development without reimbursement in any area.

Last years staff preferences for future staff development apparently were considered by supervisors. At least two of the areas supervisors reported spending a great deal of time in were areas identified by teachers and AT/A's as effective as satisfactorily provided. They were also identical to areas preferred as future topics in the 1976-77 survey.

GET SET DAY CARE
Teacher
EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT
STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
R3 (REV. 4/78)

LOG NUMBER (1)
(OFFICE USE ONLY)

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to continue documentation of the types, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of various staff development sessions across several early childhood programs.

The intent is to determine the range and extent of staff development available through the combined efforts of all personnel responsible for staff development (such as supervisory, resource, and support personnel) in each program.

Staff Development is considered to consist of all activities which lead to professional growth, including workshops, consultations, conferences, on-site visitations, meetings, newsletters, demonstrations, and informal discussions.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number following each question. You may enter comments on page 4.

We very much appreciate the time you are spending in completing this information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2 INDICATE YOUR PROGRAM:

BRIDGE
CHILD CARE
DURHAM INFANT TODDLER
FOLLOW THROUGH
FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
GET SET DAY CARE
IMPACT AID
PRE-K HEAD START
PARENT CO-OP NURSERIES
PRIMARY SKILLS
REGULAR KINDERGARTEN

3 CIRCLE THE MODEL/OPTION UTILIZED IN YOUR SCHOOL/CENTER

BANK STREET
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
BILINGUAL BICULTURAL
EDC
MONTESSORI
OPEN CLASSROOM
PARENT IMPLEMENTED
PHILADELPHIA PROCESS
RESPONSIVE LEARNING
OPTION 1
OPTION 2
OPTION 3
OPTION 4
NOT APPLICABLE

4 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW MUCH EARLY CHILDHOOD (PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 4) CLASSROOM OR CENTER EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD?

1 – 2 YEARS	0
3 – 5 YEARS	0
6 – 10 YEARS	48
OVER 10 YEARS	48

5 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH YOUR PRESENT PROGRAM?

1 – 2 YEARS	0
3 – 5 YEARS	4
6 – 10 YEARS	48
OVER 10 YEARS	43

6 INDICATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION:

TEACHER
ASSISTANT TEACHER
AIDE

		1–5	6–10	OVER 10	NONE
7	HOW MANY WORKSHOPS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS YEAR?	56	4	13	26
8	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?	61	0	13	13
9	HOW MANY ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS HAVE YOU HAD THIS YEAR?* (SEE DEFINITION BELOW)	22	35	26	17

*ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS: *(This includes all meetings, conferences, planning sessions, and discussions, as well as informal communications with resource teachers, supervisors, model consultants, staff developers and other resource personnel who have functioned in a resource capacity.)*

GET SET DAY CARE
Teacher
EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT
STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
R3 (REV. 4/78)

LOG NUMBER (1)
(OFFICE USE ONLY)

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to continue documentation of the types, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of various staff development sessions across several early childhood programs.

The intent is to determine the range and extent of staff development available through the combined efforts of all personnel responsible for staff development (such as supervisory, resource, and support personnel) in each program.

Staff Development is considered to consist of all activities which lead to professional growth, including workshops, consultations, conferences, on-site visitations, meetings, newsletters, demonstrations, and informal discussions.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number following each question. You may enter comments on page 4.

We very much appreciate the time you are spending in completing this information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2 INDICATE YOUR PROGRAM:

BRIDGE
CHILD CARE
DURHAM INFANT TODDLER
FOLLOW THROUGH
FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
GET SET DAY CARE
IMPACT AID
PRE-K HEAD START
PARENT CO-OP NURSERIES
PRIMARY SKILLS
REGULAR KINDERGARTEN

3 CIRCLE THE MODEL/OPTION UTILIZED IN YOUR SCHOOL/CENTER

BANK STREET
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
BILINGUAL BICULTURAL
EDC
MONTESSORI
OPEN CLASSROOM
PARENT IMPLEMENTED
PHILADELPHIA PROCESS
RESPONSIVE LEARNING
OPTION 1
OPTION 2
OPTION 3
OPTION 4
NOT APPLICABLE

4 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW MUCH EARLY CHILDHOOD (PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 4) CLASSROOM OR CENTER EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD?

1 – 2 YEARS	0
3 – 5 YEARS	0
6 – 10 YEARS	48
OVER 10 YEARS	48

5 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH YOUR PRESENT PROGRAM?

1 – 2 YEARS	0
3 – 5 YEARS	4
6 – 10 YEARS	48
OVER 10 YEARS	43

6 INDICATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION:

TEACHER
ASSISTANT TEACHER
AIDE

		1–5	6–10	OVER 10	NONE
7	HOW MANY WORKSHOPS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS YEAR?	56	4	13	26
8	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?	61	0	13	13
9	HOW MANY ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS HAVE YOU HAD THIS YEAR?* (SEE DEFINITION BELOW)	22	35	26	17

*ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS: *(This includes all meetings, conferences, planning sessions, and discussions, as well as informal communications with resource teachers, supervisors, model consultants, staff developers and other resource personnel who have functioned in a resource capacity.)*

13 INDICATE BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN, THOSE AREAS IN WHICH YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

	YES
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	30
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	22
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	35
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	17
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	13
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	43
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	30
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	13
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	9
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	48
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	30
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	39
LEARNING DISABILITIES	17
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	22
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	43

14 FROM THE LIST BELOW OF AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT, SELECT THE FIVE YOU PREFER MOST BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN. NEXT, SELECT THE FORM IN WHICH YOU PREFER THOSE CHOSEN BY CIRCLING "1", "2", OR "3" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	PREFERRED "FIVE"	ON-SITE CONSULTATION	ON-SITE DEMONSTRATION	WORKSHOP
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	9	4	13	13
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	4	13	4	9
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	22	9	9	22
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	17	9	4	0
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	0	4	0	13
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	17	13	9	4
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	9	13	4	0
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	4	4	0	4
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	0	0	4	0
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	13	9	0	31
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	9	4	4	17
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	9	4	9	13
LEARNING DISABILITIES	0	4	4	4
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	0	0	0	9
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	17	0	9	17

GET SET DAY CARE
Aide
EARLY CHILDHOOD EVALUATION UNIT
STAFF DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
#3 (REV. 4/78)

LOG NUMBER (1)
(OFFICE USE ONLY)

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to continue documentation of the types, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of various staff development sessions across several early childhood programs.

The intent is to determine the range and extent of staff development available through the combined efforts of all personnel responsible for staff development (such as supervisory, resource, and support personnel) in each program.

Staff Development is considered to consist of all activities which lead to professional growth, including workshops, consultations, conferences, on-site visitations, meetings, newsletters, demonstrations, and informal discussions.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number following each question. You may enter comments on page 4.

We very much appreciate the time you are spending in completing this information.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2 INDICATE YOUR PROGRAM:

BRIDGE
CHILD CARE
DURHAM INFANT TODDLER
FOLLOW THROUGH
FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
GET SET DAY CARE
IMPACT AID
PRE-K HEAD START
PARENT CO-OP NURSERIES
PRIMARY SKILLS
REGULAR KINDERGARTEN

3 CIRCLE THE MODEL/OPTION UTILIZED IN YOUR SCHOOL/CENTER

BANK STREET
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
BILINGUAL BICULTURAL
EDC
MONTESSORI
OPEN CLASSROOM
PARENT IMPLEMENTED
PHILADELPHIA PROCESS
RESPONSIVE LEARNING
OPTION 1
OPTION 2
OPTION 3
OPTION 4
NOT APPLICABLE

4 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW MUCH EARLY CHILDHOOD (PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 4) CLASSROOM OR CENTER EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD?

1 – 2 YEARS	9
3 – 5 YEARS	12
6 – 10 YEARS	48
OVER 10 YEARS	35

5 COUNTING THIS YEAR, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH YOUR PRESENT PROGRAM?

1 – 2 YEARS	6
3 – 5 YEARS	10
6 – 10 YEARS	44
OVER 10 YEARS	39

6 INDICATE YOUR PRESENT POSITION:

TEACHER
ASSISTANT TEACHER
AIDE

		1–5	6–10	OVER 10	NONE
7	HOW MANY WORKSHOPS HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS YEAR?	60	6	8	22
8	HOW MANY OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT?	46	6	8	27
9	HOW MANY ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS HAVE YOU HAD THIS YEAR?* (SEE DEFINITION BELOW)	35	17	27	14

*ON-SITE CONSULTATIONS: *(This includes all meetings, conferences, planning sessions, and discussions, as well as informal communications with resource teachers, supervisors, model consultants, staff developers, and other resource personnel who have functioned in a resource capacity.)*

10	COMPARED TO LAST YEAR, HAVE YOU HAD ON-SITE DEMONSTRATIONS/TEACHING ASSISTANCE?	MORE FREQUENTLY	LESS FREQUENTLY	SAME	NONE THIS YEAR
		19	27	8	42

11	BELOW ARE SOME SERVICES PROVIDED BY RESOURCE/SUPPORT/SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL. IF YOU ARE SATISFIED, CIRCLE "1", IF NOT, CIRCLE "2".	GENERALLY SATISFIED	GENERALLY NOT SATISFIED
	CONDUCTS WORKSHOPS	50	38
	INFORMS YOU OF PROGRAM INFORMATION, DECISIONS, AND PROCEDURES	62	27
	LOCATES AVAILABLE RESOURCE MATERIALS	67	23
	ON-SITE CLASSROOM TRAINING	60	29
	GIVES SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL CONCERNS	75	23
	OFFERS SUPPORT IN PARENT INVOLVEMENT	79	13
	ARRANGES USE OF PROFESSIONAL DAYS	62	22
	GIVES SUPPORT IN WORKING OUT CONCERNS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN	77	17
	GIVES SUGGESTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVE USE OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS	62	31
	GIVES SUPPORT IN SOLVING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	73	22

12	INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FELT STAFF DEVELOPMENT THIS YEAR RESULTED IN GREATER EFFECTIVENESS IN YOUR CLASSROOM.	EXTENT OF CHANGE		
	AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	LITTLE	MODERATE	GREAT
	SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	8	60	25
	PARENT INVOLVEMENT	14	67	14
	USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	12	48	33
	CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	6	54	25
	COMMUNITY RESOURCES	19	54	15
	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	13	61	15
	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	10	50	31
	MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	12	44	31
	MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	17	54	14
	HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	10	46	29
	IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	10	42	35
	LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	17	50	19
	INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	10	58	25
	LEARNING DISABILITIES	27	48	14
	SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	33	36	14
	USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	15	54	17

13 INDICATE BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN, THOSE AREAS IN WHICH YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

	YES
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	46
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	43
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	50
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	33
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	36
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	38
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	36
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	29
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	40
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	42
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	27
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	29
LEARNING DISABILITIES	40
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	35
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	41

14 FROM THE LIST BELOW OF AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT, SELECT THE FIVE YOU PREFER MOST BY CIRCLING "1" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN. NEXT, SELECT THE FORM IN WHICH YOU PREFER THOSE CHOSEN BY CIRCLING "1", "2", OR "3" IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	PREFERRED "FIVE"	ON-SITE CONSULTATION	ON-SITE DEMONSTRATION	WORKSHOP
SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	8	11	15	17
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	6	6	9	9
USING THE CREATIVE ARTS TO ENRICH THE CURRICULUM	6	8	15	21
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	2	4	9	15
COMMUNITY RESOURCES	2	4	2	4
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	2	6	10	4
MAKING EFFECTIVE USE OF YOUR PHYSICAL SPACE	0	10	8	4
MODEL/OPTION RELATED TRAINING	6	2	2	4
HELPING CHILDREN TAKE TESTS	2	6	10	8
IMPROVING THE BASIC SKILLS OR BASIC SKILL READINESS	8	4	8	22
LEARNING ABOUT COMMERCIAL MATERIALS	4	0	2	8
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION	2	4	6	4
LEARNING DISABILITIES	6	4	2	12
SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	4	6	2	10
USING TEACHER CENTER FACILITIES	2	6	0	6